

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the June 7, 2004 Office Action, and the amendments above together with the comments that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to address all issues raised in that Action and thereby place this case in condition for allowance. Claims 1-20 were pending in this application. In response to the Office Action dated June 7, 2004, claims 1-20 have been canceled and new claims 21-28 have been added. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate descriptive support for the present Amendment should be apparent throughout the originally filed disclosure as, for example, the depicted embodiments and related discussion thereof in the written description of the specification. Entry of the present Amendment is respectfully solicited. It is believed that this response places this case in condition for allowance. Hence, prompt favorable reconsideration of this case is solicited.

The Examiner objected to the drawings for allegedly failing to show the “adjustment mechanism” specified in the claims and referenced in the description. Claims 1-20 have been canceled and newly added claims 21-28 do not recite the term “adjustment means” and, therefore, the objections of the drawings are now moot.

The disclosure was objected to because of informalities. Applicants have reviewed the specification and have amended page 29, line 24 as suggested by the Examiner. Moreover, Applicants have corrected additional typographical errors in the specification. With respect to the Examiner’s suggestion to cancel lines 1-9 on page 13, Applicants fail to see any reason why this language is objected by the Examiner since no reasons were stated. Accordingly, absent any reasons by the Examiner as to why this passage of the specification is defective, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Claims 9, 11, 14 and 20 were objected to for minor informalities. In presenting new claims, Applicants have taken care to correct the obvious misspelling of the term “prizm” to read as “prism”. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the claim objection.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Application Publication 2003/0227597 to Silverstein et al. (hereinafter “Silverstein”). Claims 1-20 have been canceled and, therefore, the rejection is moot. Moreover, new claims 21-28 are free from the applied art for the reasons set forth *infra*.

Silverstein discloses a projection device using a diffraction type polarizing beam splitter with a wire grid. Silverstein’s projection device configuration is such that an optical beam 220 fed from a light source is polarized with a pre-polarizer 230 to provide a polarizing beam. This polarizing beam passes through the wire grid polarizing beam splitter 245 and is directed to a reflective spatial light modulator 210 through a polarizing compensator 260. Next, image light that is effective light from the reflective spatial light modulator 210 is reflected against the wire grid polarizing beam splitter 245 through a polarizing compensator 260 and reaches a projection lens 285 through a polarizing analyzer 270. In this case, the polarizing compensator 260 has a function of turnably adjusting a polarizing direction. In contrast, as recited in independent claim 21, the image light from the reflection image display device passes through the reflection polarizing plate, and then an astigmatism by the reflection polarizing plate is corrected by an astigmatism correcting element such as a cylindrical lens. It is believed that these claims features are absent from Silverstein.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The factual determination of lack of novelty under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the identical disclosure in a single reference of each

element of a claimed invention, such that the identically claimed invention is placed into the possession of one having ordinary skill in the art. As described above, there are significant differences between the claimed subject matter and the devices disclosed by Silverstein that would preclude the factual determination that Silverstein identically describes the claimed apparatus within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, new claims 21-28 are free from the applied art.

Moreover, Silverstein discloses a system in which the image light from the reflection image display device (reflective spatial light modulator) is reflected by the reflection polarizing plate (wire grid polarizing beam splitter). The conventional reflective type system requires a large-sized formation and a spacer glass for attaining a distance between the projector lens and the reflection image display device. In contrast, as disclosed in the present specification, even if the reflection polarizing plate shows a positional displacement, convergence displacement of RGB is scarcely produced (triple-plate type) or an image projecting position is scarcely changed (both the triple-plate and single plate). Second, as disclosed in the present specification, the reflection image display device in the triple-plate type can be arranged at a position spaced apart from the projection lens. Accordingly, there are produced effects such as small-sized formation, reduced back-focusing, easy manufacturing, and the like.

It is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including

10/633,597

extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Brian K. Seidleck".

Brian K. Seidleck
Registration No. 51,321

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
202.756.8000 BKS:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 24, 2004